Page 7 of 11

Reply to Office Action of July 30, 2007

**REMARKS** 

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the thorough consideration given the present

application. Claim 5 is cancelled herein without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter

contained therein. Claims 1-4 and 6-8 are pending. Claims 1-4 and 6-8 are amended. Claim 1 is

independent. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the rejections in view of the

amendments and remarks set forth herein.

**Drawings** 

The Examiner has not indicated whether or not the drawings have been accepted.

Clarification is requested in the next official communication.

Claim for Priority

It is gratefully appreciated that the Examiner has acknowledged the Applicant's claim for

foreign priority based on Japanese Patent Application No. 2003-351013.

Information Disclosure Citation

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for considering the reference supplied with the

Information Disclosure Statement filed March 20, 2006, and for providing the Applicant with an

initialed copy of the PTO form filed therewith.

Objection to the Specification

The Examiner has objected to the specification because of a number of informalities.

In response, and in accordance with MPEP §608.01(q), the Applicant herewith submits a

substitute specification in the above-identified application. Also included is a marked-up copy of

Application No. 10/572,592

Amendment dated October 12, 2007

Reply to Office Action of July 30, 2007

Docket No. 0048-0256PUS1

Page 8 of 11

the original specification which shows the portions of the original specification which are being

added and deleted. The Applicant respectfully submits that the substitute specification includes no

new matter and that the substitute specification includes the same changes as are indicated in the

marked-up copy of the original specification showing additions and deletions.

Because the number of amendments which are being made to the original specification

would render it difficult to consider the case, or to arrange the papers for printing or copying, the

Applicant has voluntarily submitted this substitute specification. Accordingly, the Applicant

respectfully requests that the substitute specification be entered into the application.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claims 1-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. This rejection is

respectfully traversed.

The Examiner has set forth certain instances wherein the claim language is not clearly

understood.

In order to overcome this rejection, the Applicant has cancelled claim 5 and have

amended claims 1-4 and 6-8 to correct each of the deficiencies specifically pointed out by the

Examiner. The Applicant respectfully submits that the claims, as amended, particularly point out

and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as the invention.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Art Unit:3677

Page 9 of 11

## Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-4 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Fukada (U.S. 4,675,939) in view of JP 09-327374A. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 5-7 have not been examined on the merits.

## Amendments to Independent Claim 1

While not conceding the appropriateness of the Examiner's rejection, but merely to advance prosecution of the present application, independent claim 1 is amended herein to recite a combination of elements directed to a curtain wave forming mechanism, including *inter alia* 

"each of said curtain hooks includes a flat-plate body section inserted vertically into a wide, vertical hook insertion hole section of a curtain tape of the curtain, the curtain tape extending along an upper edge of said curtain, a foot section bent upward at a lower end central part of said flat-plate body section to be hooked to said hook insertion hole section, a shaft section extending from an upper central part of said flat-plate body section, and a head section formed on an upper end of said shaft section, and

each of said curtain runners includes a main body running in said curtain rail, a leg section of said main body hanging below said curtain rail, a cylindrical body supported at said leg section so as to be rotatable about a vertical axis of said leg section, and a bearing section fitted to said cylindrical body for supporting said head section of each of said hooks,

wherein said flat plate body section of each of said curtain hooks is formed with a pin extending upward from each of two sides of an upper end of the flat plat body portion."

Docket No. 0048-0256PUS1 Application No. 10/572,592 Art Unit:3677 Amendment dated October 12, 2007 Page 10 of 11

Reply to Office Action of July 30, 2007

The Examiner concedes that Fukada fails to disclose a hook in the shape of a flat-plate

body. The Examiner then asserts that JP 09327374 makes up for the deficiency of Fukada. The

Applicant respectfully disagrees.

As can be seen in FIGS. 1 and 2 of JP 09327374, this document merely discloses a

screen installing part 15 that is integrally arranged in a drum case 14, the screen installing part

15 for installing an upper edge part 13a of the screen 13.

At least for the reasons explained above, the Applicants respectfully submit that the

combination of elements as set forth in independent claim 1 is not disclosed or made obvious by

the prior art of record, including Fukada and JP 09327374.

Therefore, independent claim 1 is in condition for allowance.

Dependent Claims

The Examiner will note that dependent claim 5 has been cancelled, and dependent claims

2-4 and 6-8 have been amended to place them in better form, and dependent claims 11-15 are

added to set forth additional novel features of the invention.

All dependent claims are in condition for allowance due to their dependency from allowable

independent claims, or due to the additional novel features set forth therein.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) are

respectfully requested.

## **CONCLUSION**

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and that the present application is in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, he is invited to telephone Carl T. Thomsen (Reg. No. 50,786) at (703) 208-4030(direct line).

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17, particularly extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

James M. Slattery

Reg. No. 28,380

P. O. Box 747

Falls Church, VA 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attachments: Substitute Specification - annotated and unannotated versions

JMS:CTT:kmr